

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 4 to 14 and 19 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 4-5, 8, 10-11, 14 and 19 are amended. No new subject matter is introduced by the amendments.

Rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 101 – Non-statutory subject matter

The Office Action rejects claim 19 “because the claimed invention is directed to an electrical signal containing an embedded data structure.” The Office Action states that such data structures are “not capable of causing a functional change in the computer.”

While the Applicants disagree with the Office Action, the Applicants still amend claim 19 such that it is now directed to “an electronically readable memory”.

The Applicants submit that claim 19 as amended is now directed to statutory subject matter and a reconsideration of claim 19 is earnestly requested.

Rejection of claims 4 to 14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

The Office Action rejects claims 4 to 14 for being indefinite.

In response, the Applicants amend claims 4-5, 10-11 and 14 such that they comply with 35 U.S.C. 112.

More particularly, claim 4 is amended such that the term “system/machine simulation” now reads “simulation server”.

The claim language of claims 5 and 10 is amended to have proper antecedent basis. Claim 10 is also amended to recite a structural limitation.

Claims 10 and 11 are corrected to recite a “simulation server” instead of a “simulation”.

Claim 14 is clarified and now has proper antecedent basis.

The Applicants submit that claim 4 to 14 as presented herein now clearly define the subject matter claimed. A reconsideration of these claims is kindly requested.

Rejection of claims 4-6 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in view of Schrenk et al. (U.S. 6,714,236)

The Applicants disagree with the rejections stated in the Office Action for the following reasons.

For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference “must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present.” (MPEP §706.02). “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

With respect to claim 4, the Applicants respectfully submit that Schrenk et al. do not teach every aspect of the claimed subject matter either explicitly or impliedly.

More specifically, Schrenk et al. do not disclose “a mechanical mock-up of at least a part of a system on which the training is required, the mechanical mock-up **having** a plurality of probe points **and electronically readable memories**, each one of said probe points being respectively connected to one of said electronically readable memories that respectively store a unique identifier code” as in amended claim 4.

Schrenk et al. disclose “**The processor** includes an arithmetic unit 182, a control unit 183, and a **memory 184** having **logical arrays DI1, DI2, DI3, DI4, DI5** and designated memory locations A (340), A (341), A (343) and A (202). Memory 184 also includes array tables V and R. **Logical arrays DI1 and DI2** comprise probe detection means for storing a different **digital test point identification** signal for each test point touched by probe 171. Thus, arrays DI1 and DI2 are responsive to the voltage on probe 171.” (emphasis added) (Col. 5: 5-12). Schrenk et al. teach a memory 184 for storing identification codes in logical arrays DI1 and DI2 which is located in the data processor or computer 180. The simulated electronic equipment 10 in Schrenk et al. does not have any memory device.

Hence, Schrenk et al. do not either explicitly or impliedly teach “a mechanical mock-up of at least a part of a system on which the training is required, the mechanical mock-up **having** a plurality of probe points **and electronically readable memories**, each one of said probe points

being respectively connected to one of said electronically readable memories that respectively store a unique identifier code” as claimed in amended claim 4.

The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended claim 4 is novel and non-obvious over the prior art. A reconsideration of claim 4 is kindly requested.

With respect to amended claim 19, the Applicants submit that Schrenk et al. do not teach every aspect of the claimed subject matter either explicitly or impliedly for similar reasons as those detailed hereinabove concerning claim 4.

More particularly, the Applicants submit reasons equivalent to those submitted with respect to claim 1 to highlight the fact that Schrenk et al. do not disclose “an electronically readable memory connected to, **and forming part of**, a mechanical mock-up of a system or a machine, for emitting a computer readable modulated electrical signal upon electrical contact with a probe of a simulated diagnostic tool, the signal comprising a unique identifier code to determine a probe event that indicates electrical contact between the probe and a probe point on the mechanical mock-up”, as claimed in claim 19.

The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 19 is novel and non-obvious over the prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection directed to independent 19 is respectfully requested.

The Applicants submit that in view of the foregoing arguments, the anticipation rejections directed to dependent claims 5 and 6, which are dependent on claim 4 already deemed novel over the prior art, are therefore also novel over the prior art.

The Applicants therefore submit that claims 4 to 6 and 19 are novel and non-obvious over the prior art.

Rejection of claims 7 and 8 to 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Schrenk et al. (U.S. 6,714,236) in view of Krauss et al. (U.S. 2002/0191363) and Fordham et al. (U.S. 5,067,901) respectively

The Applicants submit that the rejections directed to claims 7 and 8 to 14, which are dependent on claim 4, are moot since parent claim 4 is deemed novel and non obvious. A reconsideration of claims 7 and 8 to 14 is thus kindly requested.

In view of the foregoing arguments, a reconsideration of claims 4-14 and 19 is earnestly requested. The Applicants believe that claims are allowable over the prior art, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully,

ISON et al.

By:

/C. Marc Benoît/

C. Marc Benoît, Reg. No. 50,200
Ogilvy Renault, LLP
Client no. 020988